



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

There are ten things which intelligent pacifists may concentrate all of their intelligence upon. They may continue to urge the call of a Third Hague Conference, to which every country belonging to the society of nations shall be invited and in whose proceedings every such country shall participate. They may advocate stated meetings of that Hague Peace Conference which, thus meeting at regular, stated periods, shall become a recommending if not a lawmaking body. They may suggest an agreement of the States forming the society of nations concerning the call and procedure of the Conference, by which that institution shall become not only internationalized, but in which no nation shall take as of right a preponderating part. They may request the appointment of a committee, to meet at regular intervals between the Conferences, charged with the duty of procuring the ratification of the Conventions and Declarations and of calling attention to the Conventions and Declarations in order to insure their observance. They may recommend an understanding upon certain fundamental principles of international law, as set forth in the Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Nations, adopted by the American Institute of International Law on January 6, 1916, which are themselves based upon decisions of English courts and of the Supreme Court of the United States. They may propose the creation of an international council of conciliation to consider, to discuss, and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character as may be submitted to such council by an agreement of the powers for this purpose. They may commend the employment of good offices, mediation, and friendly composition for the settlement of disputes of a non-justiciable nature. They may approve the principle of arbitration in the settlement of disputes of a non-justiciable nature; also of disputes of a justiciable nature which should be decided by a court of justice, but which have, through delay or mismanagement, assumed such political importance that the nations prefer to submit them to arbiters of their own choice rather than to judges of a permanent judicial tribunal. They may insist upon the negotiations of a convention creating a judicial union of the nations along the lines of the Universal Postal Union of 1908; to this all civilized nations and self-governing dominions to be parties, pledging the good faith of the contracting parties to submit their justiciable disputes (that is to say, their differences involving law or equity) to a permanent court of this union, whose decisions will bind not only the litigating nations, but also all parties to its creation. And finally they may exercise their every influence to win their friends and political representatives, their government, and the world to will that these means and organs shall be set up.

We especially call the attention of our readers to the article appearing elsewhere in these columns entitled "The Organization of International Justice." In that article the principles which we have enumerated here have been carefully set forth and historically defended by one eminently competent for the task.

EDITORIAL NOTES

The Conscription of Wealth.

One of the outstanding facts of the present war is the conscription of men, the compulsory offering of flesh to bullet, shell, disease. Without discussing the ethics of such compulsory service, we find the question raised in at least two quarters, Why should there not be conscription of wealth? One of these comes out of England and the other out of the little town of Wyoming, New York. The former is elaborated in the September number of *War and Peace*, published in London; the other appears in *The Public*, signed by Mr. Waldo R. Browne.

And if there be conscription of flesh, why should there not be conscription of property? Surely the community's rights over a person's money are at least as great as its rights over his body. One of the most serious results of the war is its injury to the agencies which make for social progress. The allotments to colleges have already been reduced; the compulsory school attendance age has been reduced; religion, charities, and all of the philanthropies are suffering, and they will continue to suffer for many years, primarily because of the great war debts now being pyramided abroad. One of the great curses of civilization is, and always has been, the problem of poverty. The writer in *War and Peace* sees no reason why the money of the wealthy classes should not be conscripted for the solution of the problem. Mr. Browne's contribution is provoked by the fact that certain wealthy men in this country are contributing five thousand dollars each toward a fund for the purpose of securing legislation for universal compulsory military service. He points out that modern war and preparations for war are dependent upon money no less than upon men, and that the conscription of man power only is one-sided and inadequate. He holds that the voluntary system of raising military revenue is outworn, and that the private financial resources of the wealthy should be placed unconditionally at the disposal of the State.

The contention of both of these writers is not that the wealthy should loan their money, as now, to the Government at comfortable rates of interest, but that it should be given voluntarily or taken peremptorily and unreservedly. Both justice and expediency demand that the enforced mobilization of money should accompany the enforced mobilization of men. It is "intolerable that

human life should much longer continue to be placed on a lower plane than money."

While such a proposal carries with it many of the elements of a social revolution, the argument for the conscription of money, not in terms of loans or taxes merely, but in terms of large and conscripted sums whenever needed, seems as sound and irrefutable at least as the enforced service of men.

"What Are We Trying To Do?"

Mr. Champ Clark, Speaker of the House of Representatives, writing in *The Independent* for December 4, says flatly that: "If we attend to our own business we will never have another war. . . . The people are not willing to see this country turned into an armed camp. They are not willing to bankrupt the nation in military and naval preparations, although willing to spend all that is necessary for the public defense. They are emphatically against conscription in times of peace, but they are for it should it become necessary in time of war. . . . It is true that we are trusting to arbitration to solve all future disputes—that is, those which can be arbitrated. . . . The Hague Conference did a great deal of good; . . . the great nations of the earth cannot stand much longer this piling up of armaments by land and sea. . . . We can afford to make this suggestion looking to disarmament. . . . In the interests of world peace we can lead the way. Perhaps history will reserve to the United States the place of honor among all the nations as the one which is not afraid to insist on international peace."

Mr. Speaker, we rise to say that we are very much in accord with most of these expressions of yours. Of course, the people of this country are a little bit at sea in the matter of adequate "public defense." We do not believe with you that the people are for "conscription," even "in time of war"; but, sir, in the main we are very much pleased that your views are so nearly in accord with ours. We sincerely hope that these really are the things "we are trying to do." In the main you are very encouraging and we thank you. We hope your sentiments will spread widely and effectively through the House of Representatives, not forgetting the Senate.

Deported Belgians.

There are two statements of some significance in the German reply to our note of protest against the deportation of Belgians to Germany. One is the accusation that similar deportations of German citizens by the Allies have taken place in East Prussia and elsewhere without, seemingly, even the excuse that Germany makes for her action in Belgium; the other is that the legality of the proceeding can only be determined by knowledge of the actual conditions obtaining in Belgium and of the manner in which the deportations have been conducted, and

that neutral officials are welcome to investigate the Belgian deportations and the treatment of the deported and form their own estimate of the actual conditions. If the position be taken that anything that emanates from Germany be falsehood, these statements are worthless, of course. But this country will not do herself honor in taking such a position. From Belgium and Germany we have widely contradictory assertions, but on the German side comes the invitation to investigate and learn the truth at first hand. Our present course of action is thereby made fairly obvious.

Mexican Idealism.

The address of the "First Chief in Charge of the Executive Power of the Republic," General Carranza, delivered to the constitutional congress on the first of December, gives to the reader an adequate notion of that most vital attribute of the new Mexican government, Mexican idealism. "What is desired first of all is to establish the rights of the people to individual liberty," declared the First Chief. Can we urge arbitrarily the gross incompetence of a government that takes this principal as its highest and first? "I promise to conserve the liberal spirit of the old constitution so that the new reforms will merely eliminate the dead wood, throw light upon obscure articles, and strike out articles put in by former governments for personal advantage. The constitution must not erect artificial barriers between the state and the individual." Is not this in the spirit of the statesmen who framed our own liberal government? "There should be absolute independence of the judicial power." . . . "One object of the new reform is to assist labor, and we should set minimum wages and maximum hours." . . . "I think the vote should go to all, but that it should be taken from those making wrong use of it, or who look with indifference upon the affairs of the republic." Can we not have sympathy for such purposes as these? Can we not have patience to await their fruition?

Here are ideals kindred to our own, held by a nation struggling through what is at once the direst and most promising epoch in its history. By withholding intervention, by calling together the Mexican Commission, and by tenders already made of our willingness to help, we have done much to assist the establishment of the best government of which that nation is at present capable. We can continue this course, and do more, if we will.

Sea Power, issued by the Navy League, displays prominently a letter from a reader, of which the following is a fragment:

I desire to express the wish that you would give serious attention to a campaign to teach *real patriotism* in

our various schools. . . . It has been a really serious evil (speaking merely as a scientific student of history) to find teachers suppressing, as far as possible, all mention of wars in the history they have taught their pupils; teaching their classes that wars never determine anything and are without real significance; that their heroisms, etc., are overestimated, and the like. . . . I know a man who stands pretty high in the educational world who talks privately (and I think by implication in his class-room) that Washington and Lincoln are overestimated men because they could not avoid fighting. I have been personally advised by a really prominent publisher that I had better "cut out the references to battles

(in a school history I was issuing) just as far as I could if I wished a great many schools to adopt it." . . . The evil is a real one. . . . In making up its program for the future work I hope the Navy League will include this question of *efficient education in patriotism* near the top of its list.

This intimation that patriotic instinct must have war and battle for its food is most excellent humor. Such as this lightens the reader on his weary way. We have felt before that *Sea Power* should be congratulated on these spicy, light-hearted thoughts that it utters from time to time, and take this occasion publicly to do so.

THE ORGANIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE*

By JAMES BROWN SCOTT

SOME people, indeed many people, will consider a word in behalf of the peaceful settlement of international disputes as out of place during war. Yet a word in behalf of peaceable settlement during war is more needed than in times of peace, and a failure during war to express belief in peaceful settlement is a confession of hopelessness and defeat. It is especially during war, when the brutality and uselessness of mere physical force in the settlement of international disputes is most evident, that the partisans of peaceful settlement should not only raise their voices, but should confer together—in a multitude of counselors there is safety—in order to devise some scheme, if possible, whereby wars which may not be prevented may at least be made of less frequent occurrence. It is at the end of war, when victor and victim have suffered in their persons and property, that they are most likely to listen to the still, small voice of reason unheard or unheeded in the din of arms.

Thus, Grotius, writing in 1625 during the horrors of the Thirty Years' War, confessed his faith in a law governing the conduct of belligerents, and the principles which he gave to the world during this war made their way after it into the practice of nations.

And thus, after the horrors of the wars of the French Revolution and of the Empire, victors and victim formed themselves into a league of nations to maintain and to enforce peace, which failed because physical force cannot be, at least never has been, safely entrusted to nations to be used against their fellow-members of the society of nations. That is to say, the wars of the Revolution and of the Empire had created a desire for peace and its maintenance, and the Holy Alliance (for this is the name of that league of nations) is worthy of consideration, although we must regard the work of its hands as faulty.¹

The great war of 1914, which is slowly running its course, will one day end, and, just as in times past nations have met in conference at the conclusion of war, so they will again meet in conference at the conclusion of the war of 1914. Because of this, it seems to be of

more than passing interest for the friends of peace to confer one with another, to devise a plan more modest, it may be, than many would like, but perhaps, for that very reason, more possible of attainment; and to endeavor to secure the acceptance of this plan in the hope that the peace which is soon to be declared, for it cannot be much longer delayed, will be less readily broken in the future than in the past.

I would therefore venture to suggest concentration upon a very few points such as the following, in order to reach clear, definite, and acceptable conclusions upon them:

I.

To urge the call of a Third Hague Conference to which every country belonging to the society of nations shall be invited and in whose proceedings every such country shall participate.

If it be true, as the Gospel assures us, that in a multitude of counselors there is safety and, as we may hope, wisdom, it necessarily follows that the larger the number of the nations met in conference the greater the safety and the greater the wisdom. Indeed, there are those, whose opinions are entitled to respect, who see in the meeting of the Hague Conferences a greater hope and a greater promise than in the work of their hands. The Hague Conference of 1899 was composed of the representatives of twenty-six States; its successor of 1907 represented officially no less than forty-four sovereign, free, and independent States, which, taken together, well nigh make up the society of civilized nations.

II.

To advocate a stated meeting of the Hague Peace Conference which, thus meeting at regular, stated periods, will become a recommending if not a law-making body.

Without a radical reorganization of the society of nations, difficult, time-consuming, and perhaps impossible to bring about, the Conventions and Declarations adopted by the Conference are to be considered not as international statutes, but as recommendations, which must be submitted to the nations taking part in the Conference for their careful examination and approval. By the ratification of each of these, and by the deposit of

* An address, as revised and enlarged, delivered before the Conference of Peace Workers, New York City, Oct. 26, 1916.

(¹) Phillips' *Confederation of Europe: A Study of the European Alliance, 1813-1823, as an Experiment in the International Organization of Peace (1914)*.